UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/628,307	07/29/2003	Jobst La Dous	100341.52572US	4469	
23911 7590 01/29/2007 CROWELL & MORING LLP			EXAMINER		
	AL PROPERTY GROU	TP .	FIGUEROA, JOHN J		
P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1712		
	· <del>Y</del> -				
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/29/2007	PAPER		

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/628,307	DOUS, JOBST LA				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	John J. Figueroa	1712				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  (36(a)). In no event, however, may a reply be ting  will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from  e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 D	<u>Pecember 2006</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 4-11 is/are pending in the applied 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 4-11 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informat P 6) Other:	ate				

Application/Control Number: 10/628,307 Page 2

Art Unit: 1712

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 11 depends from claim 6, which in turn, depends from claim 4. Claim 11, as amended, is extremely confusing and not further limiting of its parent claims. The claim is drawn to a method of producing a resin body comprising, inter alia, initially producing a first polymer network by a polyaddition reaction, subsequently producing a second polymer network by thermal, radical or UV polymerization, and forming the body *simultaneously* with the steps of producing said first and second polymer networks. It is unclear and confusing as to how one skilled in the art can form the second polymer network subsequent to forming the first polymer network while, at the same time, *simultaneously* form the resin body AND also said first and second polymer networks by a polyaddition reaction and by either a thermal, radical or UV-light polymerization, respectively.

Application/Control Number: 10/628,307

Art Unit: 1712

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Page 3

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1 and 4-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,886,101 to Sommerfeld et al., hereinafter 'Sommerfeld', in view of Applicant's admitted prior art in paragraph [0025] of the specification. See MPEP §2129 [R-2].

Sommerfeld disclose articles that are formed from two polymer networks of different polymer materials. (Col. 2, line 60 through col. 3, line 10 and col. 13, lines 45-47) Sommerfeld discloses preferred interpenetrating networks that include polyurethane/acrylic networks. Sommerfeld does not expressly teach that the articles are transparent. However, because the network taught by Sommerfeld contains the same polymers set forth in the instant claims, the articles produced from this network would inherently be transparent.

Sommerfeld discloses that photochromic systems are employed and that dyes are added to the interpenetrating networks. (Col. 15, lines 23-14 and col. 19, line 63) Sommerfeld further discloses the sequential formation of the interpenetrating polyurethane/acrylic network, where the first polyurethane network is formed without an initiator and where the second acrylic network is formed in the presence of heat. (See, e.g., Example 7, columns 32-33) Sommerfeld discloses that inorganic filler can be added (col. 22, lines 49-52) and that the plastic materials produced can be used in automobile production, which would include window glazings (col. 13, lines 36-47).

Art Unit: 1712

Sommerfeld further discloses that the polymerization residues of the composition of matter containing the interpenetrable polymeric network (body formed from polymerization) can contain a pigment or a colorant dispersed therein and be used as films for semi-permeable membranes, for structural automobile parts and panels, as mold release films, adhesive films, as a photoresist for printed circuit boards, solder masks, and as plastic materials in aircraft. (Col. 13, lines 17-48 and 55-66; col. 14, lines 27-67; col. 23, line 65 to col. 24, line 18; col. 24, line 32 to col. 25, line 29; col. 25, lines 50-65) In addition, Sommerfeld teaches that these interpenetrable polymeric networks have superior toughness-flexibility and solvent-resistance and that these polymeric composition products are particularly useful in photosensitive compositions, such as photoresists and solder masks. (Col. 13, lines 49-54)

Although Sommerfeld teaches that photochromic dyes are added, Sommerfeld fails to teach that the dyeing process is accomplished through a mass dyeing process wherein the dye is added prior or during the polymerization reaction.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time that the claimed invention was made, to use the formed product (body) during Sommerfeld's polymerization process in an application, such as a photoresist or as a solder mask. It would have been obvious to one in the art to do so to provide a photoresist or solder mask having enhanced marketable properties, such as toughness-flexibility and solvent-resistance, in accordance with Sommerfeld's own teachings.

Moreover, on page 7, in paragraph [0025] of the specification, Applicant states that the economical and technical advantages of mass dyeing as compared to

subsequent surface dyeing by diffusion are well known to a person skilled in the art. Therefore, it would have also been obvious to one in the art at the time of the invention to employ a mass dyeing technique to the compositions of Sommerfeld when a photochromic dye is desired. The motivation would have been that as stated by applicant, there are economical and technical advantages of this process that one of ordinary skill in the art would have wanted to obtain in utilizing the compositions of Sommerfeld. As a result of this process, the photochromic dye would be homogenously

Page 5

Thus, the claims are unpatentable over Sommerfeld.

distributed in the interpenetrating polymer network.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 18, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's principal argument is that Sommerfeld does not expressly disclose the dye to be homogeneously distributed within the interpenetrating polymer networks. Aside from Applicant's own declaration, there is no evidence to show that, as discussed above, upon the obvious use of a mass dyeing technique to form the compositions of Sommerfeld when incorporating a desired photochromic dye, the photochromic dye would not be homogenously distributed in the interpenetrating polymer network. It is unclear from Applicant's arguments (and no evidence to support a showing to the contrary) as to why the interpenetrable polymer networks disclosed in Sommerfeld would not have the dye homogeneously distributed therein, when formed by an obvious mass dyeing technique as recited in the instant claims.

Art Unit: 1712

Therefore, the claims, as amended, remain unpatentable over Sommerfeld.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Figueroa whose telephone number is (571) 272-8916. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs & alt. Fri 8:00-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JJF/RAG

RANDY GULAKOWSKI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Page 6